

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided generally to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art. Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-34 were rejected. Claims 1, 11, 21, 26 and 31 have been amended. No new matter has been added. This amendment is being filed concurrently with A REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE).

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0128891 ("McSherry"). Claims 2-4, 6, 12-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McSherry in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0027481 ("Whyel"). Claims 7-10 and 17-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McSherry in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0072974 ("Pugliese"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

McSherry discusses a specialist answering a call and receiving a unique ID code that represents the caller. The unique ID code can be entered into the database to display information about the *current* caller. For example, in McSherry:

"In one embodiment, each contact is assigned a unique ID code as identifying information. When a situation arises that requires workplace services, a contact places a telephone call to a predetermined "help line" telephone number. A specialist answers the call and receives the unique ID code from the contact. When the received ID code is entered into the database, information concerning the employer is displayed to the specialist." (paragraph 9 lines 1-8)

Further, McSherry (paragraph [0029] and [0045]) shows,

“In accordance with the principles of the invention, this link allows experts and specialists located at service providers 112 to obtain detailed information concerning a client, client contact persons and associated data at the time that the specialist is talking to the contact person..” (paragraph 29)

“... the ID code is used to access the contact and client records in the appropriate knowledge management database tables. In particular, the specialist enters the ID code into a local computer that is connected to the knowledge management database, via the Internet. the contact and client records are then returned to the local computer and displayed on the specialist's screen.” (paragraph 46)

To facilitate the lookup of information about the current caller, McSherry discloses a database system (e.g., Figure 2 and paragraphs [0031-0037]. The database system of McSherry includes a client table which is used to store the information of clients. According to the database table relations, a client may be associated with an affiliation; and an affiliation may also be associated with an affiliation. For example, McSherry (paragraph [0036]) shows:

“each service provider represented by a record in table 210 is also associated with an affiliation. ... the clients represented by table 200 may also be associated with affiliations 218. In particular, each record in the client table 200 may include an affiliation ID to associate the client with an affiliation in table 218, as indicated by arrow 224.” (paragraph 36)

Applicant respectfully submits that McSherry does not anticipate claims 1, 5, 11 and 15, since McSherry does not disclose each and every element of claims 1, 5, 11 and 15. For example, claim 1 recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:

determining a service provider ID code of a service provider based on a request received from the service provider;
based on the determined service provider ID code, generating a list of service seekers having received advice from the service provider;
and
displaying the listing of service seekers, via a customer display screen, to enable relationship management of the listed service seekers.

McSherry does not explicitly disclose the generation of “a list of service seekers **having received** advice from the service provider” based on the determined service provider ID code.

The Office Action asserted that McSherry teaches a “service provider ID”. Although McSherry discloses a database system which may have stored a “service provider ID”, data stored in a database system is clearly insufficient for the anticipation of a claim that is related to a specific usage of “service provider ID”. McSherry does not show that the “service provider ID” stored in the database is used in a process as claimed in the pending claims. Specifically, McSherry does not show an operation of “generating a list of service seekers having received advice from the service provider” based on the determined service provider ID code. McSherry discloses the display of information about the current caller based on the contact ID of caller.

Further, in McSherry, the information displayed to the specialist is looked up based on the contact ID that is the ID associated with the service seeker. Thus, the description of McSherry related to “*information concerning the employer is displayed to the specialist*” is not applicable to the pending claims 1, 5, 11 and 15.

Furthermore, McSherry does not show an operation to display such a generated list of service seekers who have received advice from the service provider.

Claim 5 further recites “querying a service seeker transaction database to determine the list of service seekers having received advice communication from a service provider matching the service provider ID code”. McSherry does not show a **transaction** database. McSherry does not show a specific operation of querying a transaction database “to determine the list of service

seekers having received advice communication from a service provider matching the service provider ID code”.

Thus, at least for the above reasons, McSherry does not anticipate claims 1, 5, 11 and 15.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 21 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McSherry in view of Pugliese. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 21 and 26 includes the limitations of “receiving a customer management screen listing one or more service seekers having previously received advice communication from the service provider based on an identity of the service provider,” which is not disclosed in McSherry and Pugliese.

Thus, the cited references do not show each and every aspects of claims 21 and 26. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested for claims 21 and 26.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McSherry in view of Pugliese. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 31 specifies the limitation of “based on the determined service provider ID code generate a list of service seekers having received advice from a service provider,” which is not disclosed in McSherry and Pugliese.

Thus, the cited references do not show each and every aspect of claim 31. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested for claim 31.

Since the cited references do not show each and every aspects of the independent claims 1, 11, 21, 26 and 31, the dependent claims of these independent claims are also patentable over the cited references, at least for the above discussed reasons. The withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested for the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner need to contact the undersigned, please do so at (650)328-8500.

Please credit any overpayments and charge any fee deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-2638, referencing Attorney Docket No. 76705-202001/US.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 8, 2006

/JOHN P. WARD/
John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

CUSTOMER NUMBER 64494

Phone: (650) 328-8500

Fax: (650) 328-8508

E-mail: wardj@gtlaw.com